UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,674	02/25/2004	Marc Shapiro	MS1-1730US	3021

22971	7590	08/24/2006	

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER
MORRISON, JAY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/786,674	SHAPIRO ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Jay A. Morrison	2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 February 2004</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 February 2004</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/21/05</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-48 are pending.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities:

a.   As per claim 16, line 1: "the second computer-related source" should be

"the first computer-related source". (note: claims 15 and 16 are identical)

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7-12,24-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7-12 and 24-29 each recite the limitation "the recorded action of the first

computer-related source," respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these

limitations in the claims. For purposes of examination it is assumed the Applicant meant

"the action of the first computer-related source".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   Claims 1-4,7-17,36,39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims do not recite a practical application by producing a physical transformation or producing a useful, concrete, and tangible result. To perform a physical transformation, the claimed invention must transform an article or physical object into a different state or thing. Transformation of data is not a physical transformation. A useful, concrete, and tangible result must be either specifically recited in the claim or flow inherently therefrom. To be useful the claimed invention must establish a specific, substantial, and credible utility. To be concrete the claimed invention must be able to produce the same results given the same initial starting conditions. To be tangible the claimed invention must produce a practical application or real world result. In this case the claims fail to perform a physical transformation because the claims are directed to operating on data. The claims are useful and concrete, but they fail to product a tangible result because the result is not stored in a non-volatile medium or, for example, reported to a user.

6.   Claims 18-34,37,40 recites "a computer program product", which is defined on page 3 of the specification of the invention as including a carrier wave. Because carrier waves, being a form of electromagnetic energy, do not fall into one of the statutory categories of 35 U.S.C. 101, the claim includes non-statutory subject matter. A detailed

explanation describing why carrier waves are regarded as non-statutory subject matter

under 35 U.S.C. 101 follows:

> Claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy, such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are nonstatutory natural phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 112-14. Moreover, it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101.

> First, a claimed signal is clearly not a "process" under § 101 because it is not a series of steps. The other three § 101 classes of machine, compositions of matter and manufactures "relate to structural entities and can be grouped as 'product' claims in order to contrast them with process claims." 1 D. Chisum, Patents § 1.02 (1994). The three product classes have traditionally required physical structure or material.

> "The term machine includes every mechanical device or combination of mechanical device or combination of mechanical powers and devices to perform some function and produce a certain effect or result." Corning v. Burden, 56 U.S. (15 How.) 252, 267 (1854). A modern definition of machine would no doubt include electronic devices which perform functions. Indeed, devices such as flip-flops and computers are referred to in computer science as sequential machines. A claimed signal has no physical structure, does not itself perform any useful, concrete and tangible result and, thus, does not fit within the definition of a machine.

> A "composition of matter" "covers all compositions of two or more substances and includes all composite articles, whether they be results of chemical union, or of mechanical mixture, or whether they be gases, fluids, powders or solids." Shell Development Co. v. Watson, 149 F. Supp. 279, 280, 113 USPQ 265, 266 (D.D.C. 1957), aff'd, 252 F.2d 861, 116 USPQ 428 (D.C. Cir. 1958). A claimed signal is not matter, but a form of energy, and therefore is not a composition of matter.

> The Supreme Court has read the term "manufacture" in accordance with its dictionary definition to mean "the production of articles for use from raw or prepared materials by giving to these materials new forms, qualities, properties, or combinations, whether by hand-labor or by machinery." Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 447 U.S. 303, 308, 206 USPQ 193, 196-97 (1980) (quoting American Fruit Growers, Inc. v. Brogdex Co., 283 U.S. 1, 11, 8 USPQ 131, 133 (1931), which, in turn, quotes the Century Dictionary). Other courts have applied similar definitions. See American Disappearing Bed Co. v. Arnaelsteen, 182 F. 324, 325 (9th Cir. 1910), cert. denied, 220 U.S. 622 (1911). These definitions require physical substance, which a claimed signal does not have. Congress can be presumed to be aware of an administrative or judicial interpretation of a statute and to adopt that interpretation when it re-enacts a statute without change. Lorillard v. Pons, 434 U.S. 575, 580 (1978). Thus,

Congress must be presumed to have been aware of the interpretation of
manufacture in American Fruit Growers when it passed the 1952 Patent Act.

A manufacture is also defined as the residual class of product. 1 Chisum, §
1.02[3] (citing W. Robinson, The Law of Patents for Useful Inventions 270 (1890)).

A product is a tangible physical article or object, some form of matter, which a
signal is not. That the other two product classes, machine and composition of
matter, require physical matter is evidence that a manufacture was also intended to
require physical matter. A signal, a form of energy, does not fall within either of the
two definitions of manufacture. Thus, a signal does not fall within one of the four
statutory classes of § 101.

7.   As per claims 35,38,41, these claims disclose a system but do not describe any

hardware which is required for a system claim to be statutory. Accordingly, these

system claims are rejected as non-statutory for failing to disclose any hardware.

8.   As per claims 43-48, the cited claims do not produce a tangible result. Data

structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive

material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional

change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760

(claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not

define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and

other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to

be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data

structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure

and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's

functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. In addition, claims that do not in any

way make tangible any results are also not statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10.   Claims 1-4,7,13-14,17-21,24,30-31,33-41,43-48 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mellen-Garnett et al. ('Mellen-Garnett'

hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0093479).

        As per claim 1, Mellen-Garnett teaches

        A method comprising: (see abstract)

        recording action information pertaining to an action of a first computer-related

source and an associated relationship with a recorded action of a second computer-

related source; (one or more applications, paragraphs [0034],[0041])

executing an action management operation on the action of the first computer-

related source and the recorded action of the second computer-related source.

(collaboration module, paragraph [0041],[0043])

As per claim 2, Mellen-Garnett teaches

registering the first computer-related source with an action management module

that receives action information about actions associated with multiple computer-related

sources. (paragraph [0043])

As per claim 3, Mellen-Garnett teaches

registering the second computer-related source with an action management

module that receives action information about actions associated with multiple

computer-related sources. (paragraph [0043])

As per claim 4, Mellen-Garnett teaches

detecting selection of the recorded action of the first computer-related source

from a plurality of recorded actions of the first computer-related source and the second

computer-related source. (paragraph [0041],[0043])

As per claim 7, Mellen-Garnett teaches

the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action

management facility of the first computer-related source to undo the recorded action of

the first computer-related source. (paragraph [0051])

As per claim 13, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

the second computer-related source is an application. (paragraph [0041])

As per claim 14, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

the second computer-related source is an inactive application and further

comprising: executing the inactive application responsive to execution of the action

management operation. (paragraph [0034])

As per claim 17, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

the second computer-related source is a computer process. (paragraph [0033])

As per claims 18-21,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given

above for rejected claims 1-4 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 24,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above

for rejected claim 7 and is similarly rejected.

As per claims 30-31,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 13-14 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 33, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

the second computer-related source is an inactive document and the computer process further comprises: executing an application on the inactive document responsive to execution of the action management operation. (paragraph [0034])

As per claim 34,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 17 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 35,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 36, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

A method comprising: (see abstract)

recording action information for one or more logical actions of a first computer-related source and an associated relationship with a recorded logical action of a second computer-related source. (collaboration module, paragraph [0041],[0043])

As per claim 37,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 36 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 38,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 36 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 39, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

A method comprising: (see abstract)

registering a first computer-related source with an action management module; (collaboration module, paragraph [0043])

registering a second computer-related source with the action management module; (collaboration module, paragraph [0043])

and recording action information relating to an action of the first computer-related source and an associated relationship with a recorded action of a second source. (one or more applications, paragraphs [0034],[0041])

As per claim 40,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above

for rejected claim 39 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 41, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

A system comprising: (see abstract)

an action management module registering a first computer-related source with an

action management module and registering a second computer-related source with the

action management module; (collaboration module, paragraph [0043])

and an action log recording action information relating to an action of the first

computer-related source and an associated relationship with a recorded action of a

second source. (one or more applications, paragraphs [0034],[0041])

As per claim 43, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

One or more computer-readable media storing a data structure comprising: (see

abstract)

a first data field storing an action identifier for a primary action; (storage,

paragraphs [0046]-[0047])

a second data field storing a source identifier for a first computer-related source

associated with the action identifier; (storage, paragraphs [0046]-[0047])

a third data field storing a related action identifier for a related action; (storage,

paragraphs [0046]-[0047])

and a fourth data field storing a source identifier for a second computer-related

source associated with the related action identifier. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 44, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

a fifth field storing a relationship descriptor specifying the relationship between

the primary action and the related action. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 45, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

a fifth field storing a container action identifier identifying a container action

containing the primary action within the action hierarchy. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 46, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

a fifth field storing a component action identifier identifying a component action

contained by the primary action within the action hierarchy. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 47, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

the data structure is recorded in an action log and further comprising: a fifth field

storing an inactive flag indicating that the primary action has been made inactive but the

data structure remains persistent the action log. (storage, paragraphs [0046])

As per claim 48, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

a fifth field storing an action descriptor describing the primary action. (storage,

paragraphs [0046])

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12.   Claims 5-6,15-16,22-23,32,42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mellen-Garnett et al. ('Mellen-Garnett' hereinafter) (Publication

Number 2003/0093479) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of De Meno et

al. ('De Meno' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,721,767).

As per claim 5, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

of the first computer-related source and the second computer-related source in accordance with causal relationships among the recorded actions. (paragraph [0034])

<u>Mellen-Garnett</u> does not explicitly indicate "displaying recorded actions"

However, <u>De Meno</u> discloses "displaying recorded actions" (figure 4; column 5, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> and <u>De Meno</u> because using the steps of "displaying recorded actions" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to earlier states.

As per claim 6, <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> teaches

of the first computer-related source and the second computer-related source in accordance with chronological relationships among the recorded actions. (paragraph [0034])

<u>Mellen-Garnett</u> does not explicitly indicate "displaying recorded actions"

However, <u>De Meno</u> discloses "displaying recorded actions" (figure 4; column 5, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine <u>Mellen-Garnett</u> and <u>De Meno</u> because using the steps

of "displaying recorded actions" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to   / earlier states.

As per claim 15,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "the second computer-related source is a document object."

However, De Meno discloses "the second computer-related source is a document object" (column 3, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and De Meno because using the steps of "the second computer-related source is a document object" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to earlier states.

As per claim 16,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "the second computer-related source is a document object."

However, De Meno discloses "the second computer-related source is a document object" (column 3, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and De Meno because using the steps

of "the second computer-related source is a document object" would have given those

skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing modifications between

backups to be retrieved. This gives the user the advantage of not having being able to

roll back modifications to earlier states.

As per claims 22-23,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given

above for rejected claims 5-6 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 32,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above

for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected.

As per claim 42, Mellen-Garnett teaches

A method in a computer system for displaying on a display device logical actions

of a first computer-related source and a second computer-related source, the method

comprising: (see abstract)

receiving a reference to an action of a first computer-related source and an

associated relationship with an action of a second computer-related source; (one or

more applications, paragraphs [0034],[0041])

of the action of a first computer-related source and a representation of the action

of a second computer-related source; (paragraph [0034])

of a relationship between the action of a first computer-related source and the

action of a first computer-related source. (paragraph [0034])

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "displaying a representation".

De Meno discloses "displaying a representation" (figure 4; column 5, lines 30-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and De Meno because using the steps

of "displaying a representation" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to

improve the invention by allowing modifications between backups to be retrieved. This

gives the user the advantage of not having being able to roll back modifications to

earlier states.

13.   Claims 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mellen-Garnett et al. ('Mellen-Garnett' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0093479)

as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nainani et al. ('Nainani' hereinafter)

(Patent Number 6,185,577).

As per claim 8,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "the executing operation comprises:

instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related

source to redo the recorded action of the first computer-related source."

However, Nainani discloses "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to redo the recorded action of the first computer-related source." (column 8, lines 6-18)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Nainani because using the steps of "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to redo the recorded action of the first computer-related source" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by roll forward changes after data is recovered. This gives the user the advantage of not losing changes and being able to reset the state of data.

As per claim 25,

This claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected.

14.   Claims 9-12,26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellen-Garnett et al. ('Mellen-Garnett' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2003/0093479) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Multer et al. ('Multer' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,925,476).

As per claim 9,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action."

However, Multer discloses "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action" (column 2, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Multer because using the steps of "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing a change to a modification to be made retroactively. This gives the user the advantage of being able to undo a single change retroactively and no have to redo the intervening changes.

As per claim 10,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of a different action type."

However, Multer discloses "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of a different action type" (column 2, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Multer because using the steps of "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of a different action type" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing a change to a modification to be made retroactively. This gives the user the advantage of being able to undo a single change retroactively and no have to redo the intervening changes.

As per claim 11,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of the same action type having different action parameters."

However, Multer discloses "the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with another action of the same action type having different action parameters" (column 2, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Multer because using the steps of

"the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management

facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first

computer-related source with another action of the same action type having different

action parameters" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the

invention by allowing a change to a modification to be made retroactively. This gives the

user the advantage of being able to undo a single change retroactively and no have to

redo the intervening changes.

As per claim 12,

Mellen-Garnett does not explicitly indicate "the executing operation comprises:

instructing a source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related .

source to replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with multiple

actions."

However, Multer discloses "the executing operation comprises: instructing a

source-specific action management facility of the first computer-related source to

replace the recorded action of the first computer-related source with multiple actions"

(column 2, lines 1-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Mellen-Garnett and Multer because using the steps of

"the executing operation comprises: instructing a source-specific action management

facility of the first computer-related source to replace the recorded action of the first

computer-related source with multiple actions" would have given those skilled in the art

the tools to improve the invention by allowing a change to a modification to be made

retroactively. This gives the user the advantage of being able to undo a single change

retroactively and no have to redo the intervening changes.

As per claim 26-29,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given

above for rejected claims 9-12 and are similarly rejected.

Conclusion

15.   The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is

considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-

7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison   Tim Vo
TC2100   TC2100